

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,387	STAHMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yun H. Lee	3766	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Yun H. Lee.

(3) _____.

(2) Suneel Arora.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 October 2006

Time: 4 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Hartley et al. (US Pat. No. 6,076,015), Street et al. (US Pat. No. 6,589,188), Zhu et al. (US Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 20030028221)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Firstly, Examiner pointed out that the claimed classification of respiration having increased inhalation duration and decreased exhalation duration appeared to be a typographical error where the words 'increased' and 'decreased' were switched around. Applicant agreed and asked for this to be properly amended. Next, Examiner noted that the terms 'obstructed respiration' and 'restrictive respiration', lacking an art-recognized specific meaning, are being interpreted using the broadest reasonable meaning of the words 'obstructed' and 'restrictive' in which case the classification of Cheyne-Stokes respiration reads on these limitations. Thus, to make the claimed limitations more specific and more correspondent to the specification, Applicant agreed to amend these terms to 'pulmonary obstructive disease' and 'a restrictive respiration disease'..